

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Clough, et al.) Confirmation No: 8648
)
Serial No.: 10/004,173) Group Art Unit: 2625
)
Filed: October 9, 2001) Examiner: Milia, Mark R.
)
For: Method for Authenticating Mobile Printer Users) Atty. Docket No.: 10012945-1
)

REPLY BRIEF RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

The Examiner's Answer mailed June 15, 2007 has been carefully considered.

In response thereto, please consider the following remarks.

AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those which may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

REMARKS

The Examiner has provided in the Examiner's Answer various responses to arguments contained in Applicant's Appeal Brief. Although the Examiner's Answer has added some additional remarks in response to Applicant's arguments, the substance of the rejections and the Examiner's positions have not changed. Accordingly, Applicant stands behind the arguments set forth in the Appeal Brief. In addition, Applicant addresses selected responses in the following.

Regarding claims 1-5, the Examiner's Answer states that *in DeBry*, "the terms printer, print server, and printing systems are used interchangeably as well as the terms file server, file source, etc. Thus, the document source 10 and the print server 30 can be seen to be one device with a document source database and print server/printing functions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the authentication process of DeBry with the system of Barnard." Page 9. Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

As is described by *DeBry*, a request to print a particular document is provided to a "document source 10," which stores files which may be available for printing. See col. 7, lines 15-16. Upon receiving the request, the document source creates a "will-call certificate" based upon the request and provides the certificate to the user. See col. 7, lines 16-19. The will-call certificate contains information that instructs the printer where to go to get the document. See col. 7, lines 20-25. The user then takes the will-call request, builds a print request, and then sends the print request to the print server 30, which comprises the printer. See col. 7, lines 43-45; col. 6, lines 62-66; FIG. 3. The print server then goes to the document source, requests the document, and gives the

will-call certificate to the document source. See col. 7, lines 50-53. The document source then verifies the identity of the printer and provides the requested document to the printer for printing. See col. 8, lines 32-36.

It is the Examiner's contention that the document source and print server may be the same device. However, if this was the case, then there would be no purpose for a will-call certificate. The will-call certificate contains the distinguished name of the document source, a path to the file, *etc.* so that a print server can locate and request data from the document source. If the print server and the document source was the same device, the device would not need a path for locating itself, and therefore, would not require a will-call certificate. See abstract and summary. Hence, *DeBry* teaches that the document source is separate from the printer, as shown in FIGs. 1 and 3 of *DeBry*. As a result, the Examiner's basis for the proposed combination is improper, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Using similar reasoning, the proposed combination of *Barnard* in view of *DeBry* does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 6-18. For the reasons presented herein and the reasons earlier presented in the Appeal Brief, the cited references are deficient in disclosing claimed features, and the arguments set forth in the Appeal Brief still stand. The rejection of the pending claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In summary, it is Applicant's position that Applicant's claims are patentable over the applied cited art references and that the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Appellant therefore respectfully requests that the Board of Appeals overturn the Examiner's rejection and allow Applicant's pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Charles W. Griggers
Registration No. 47,283